

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/07/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regards to the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 19 as being anticipated by Dettinger et al Applicant argues that Dettinger fails to teach or suggest the new claim limitation of "identification means distinct from the at least one wireless communication interface". Examiner respectfully disagrees as Dettinger et al in paragraph [0032] discloses that the processor 30 (as seen in Fig. 2) is capable of networking, thus identifying, with another wireless device through the communication interface 36. While the processor may receive information through the interface it is still a distinct and separate entity as seen in Fig. 2, thus identification means distinct from the at least one wireless communication interface. Therefore the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 19 as well as all other rejections are maintained.
2. Claims 1-17, 19, and 21-22 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2617

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3 and 7-17, 19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dettinger et al (pub # 20030143954).

Consider claims 1, 11, and 12. Dettinger teaches Mobile device allowing a fast constitution of a communication connection providing for device interoperability, comprising at least one wireless communication interface and identification means, wherein said wireless communication interface is adapted to provide a wireless communication with another mobile device, wherein said identification means is adapted to obtain configuration information from said other mobile device being arranged to provide said configuration information; **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

wherein said configuration information is adapted to provide a communication connection with said other mobile device via said wireless communication interface and a hand over of at least partial control over said mobile device to said other mobile device or vice versa. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 19. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches Computer program product for executing a method allowing of fast constitution of a communication connection providing for device interoperability, comprising a machine-readable storage medium and program code sections stored on the machine-readable medium, the program code sections comprising:

Art Unit: 2617

program code sections for obtaining configuration information from said other mobile device by identification means comprised by said mobile device; **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

program code sections for processing said configuration information by said mobile device to constitute communications with said other mobile device by **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

program code sections for establishing a communication connection with said other mobile device via a wireless communication interface comprised by said mobile device and distinct from the identification means; **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).** and

program code sections for handing over at least partially control over said mobile device to said other mobile device, or vice versa based on the configuration information. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 2. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches wherein said at least partial control corresponds to a selective control corresponding to functionality of at least one of said mobile device and said other mobile device. **(See at least paragraph [0032]).**

Consider claim 3. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches wherein said control relates to at least one of a group of controls comprising control over operations of said devices, control over one or more interfaces

Art Unit: 2617

of said devices comprising user interfaces and control over one or more applications of said devices. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 7. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches Mobile device according to claim 1, wherein said wireless communication interface is one out of a group of interfaces including a low power radio frequency interface, an infrared-based communication interface and a cellular interface. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 8. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches Mobile device according to claim 7, wherein said low power radio frequency interface is one out of a group of interfaces including a Bluetooth interface and a wireless local area network interface. **(See at least paragraph [0031]).**

Consider claim 9. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches wherein at least one of said mobile device and said other mobile device is another radio terminal device. **(See at least paragraph [0032]).**

Consider claim 10. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger further teaches Mobile device according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said mobile device and said other mobile device is a core device of a multipart radio terminal device arrangement and said other one is a peripheral device of said multipart radio terminal

device arrangement. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 13. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches said handing over said at least partial control corresponds to a handing over of selective control, wherein said selectivity depends on functionality of at least one of said mobile device and said other mobile device. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 14. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches checking on the basis of said configuration information whether said other mobile device is trustworthy. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 15. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches transferring said control in accordance with said configuration information. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 16. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches disestablishing a previously constituted communication connection to a third mobile device; and transferring control previously exercised by said third mobile device over said mobile device to said other mobile device. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 17. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Dettinger further teaches wherein said mobile device comprises at least one wireless communication interface and identification means, wherein said wireless communication interface is adapted to provide a wireless communication with said other mobile device wherein said identification means is adapted to obtain said configuration information from said other mobile device and wherein said configuration information is adapted to provide a communication connection with said other mobile device via said wireless communication interface and a hand over of at least partial control over said mobile device to said other mobile device or vice versa. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 21. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 19. Dettinger further teaches A computer program product according to Claim 19 further comprising program code sections for transferring control previously exercised by a third mobile device over said mobile device to said other mobile device. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

Consider claim 22. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 21. Dettinger further teaches A computer program product according to Claim 21 further comprising program code sections for disestablishing a previously constituted communication connection with the third mobile device. **(See at least paragraphs [0032] and [0033]).**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger et al (pub # 20030143954) in view of Forstadius et al (pub # 20020154607).

Consider claim 4. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger does not specifically disclose identification means comprise radio frequency identification (RFID) means, preferably one out of a group including a radio frequency identification reader and a radio frequency identification transponder. However

Art Unit: 2617

Forstadius et al in at least paragraph [0025] does disclose RFID. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the RFID reader of Forstadius et al with the system of Dettinger et al in order to provide a system that is cost efficient and which can easily be implemented. (Forstadius paragraph [0005]).

Consider claim 5. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger does not specifically disclose wherein said other mobile device implements an identification means operable with said identification means of said mobile device, wherein said identification means comprise preferably radio frequency identification (RFID) means, more preferably one out of said group including a radio frequency identification transponder, a radio frequency identification transponder reader and a radio frequency identification transponder reader capable for writing. However Forstadius et al in at least paragraph [0025] does disclose RFID. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the RFID reader of Forstadius et al with the system of Dettinger et al in order to provide a system that is cost efficient and which can easily be implemented. (Forstadius paragraph [0005]).

Consider claim 6. Dettinger teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Dettinger does not specifically disclose Mobile device according to claim 1, wherein said configuration information comprises at least one out of a group of configuration



Art Unit: 2617

information including: communication interface configuration information; device type; device identifier; and personal identifier. However Forstadius et al in at least paragraph [0009] does disclose that each of the transceivers having a unique identifier. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the identifier of Forstadius et al with the system of Dettinger et al in order to provide a system that is cost efficient and which can easily be implemented. (Forstadius paragraph [0005]).

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAYCE BIBBEE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2617

(571)270-7222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

CHAYCE BIBBEE  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2617